



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/722,828	11/28/00	NINOMIYA	107971

EXAMINER	
J. DOTE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1756	16

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Mr. James Voeller (Reg. No. 48,015) (3)  
(2) Janis L. Dote (PTO) (4)

Date of interview: Apr. 11, 2003

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☐ was not reached.

Claims discussed: none

Identification of prior art discussed: none

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The examiner telephoned applicants' representative Mr. Voeller regarding his request for an interview before the issuance of a first Office action. Mr. Voeller stated that he wanted to summarize and discuss the arguments in the amendment filed with the RCE, and to clarify any questions that the examiner may have regarding said arguments. The examiner noted that in the amendment, Mr. Voeller provided extensive arguments as to why the amendment to Table 6 did not introduce new matter into the specification and traversing the enablement rejection with respect to the ASKER C hardness value. The examiner denied the interview because she did not believe that the interview would expedite prosecution. She suggested that Mr. Voeller request an interview after the issuance of the first Office action, so that her comments regarding his arguments would be on the written record and that the issues discussed in that interview would be based on the written record.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)


- 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 of the second page of this form).

If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

- ☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

PTOL-413 (REV. 2-93)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's Signature